Applicants have made the changes kindly suggested by the Examiner in paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Office Action. Claims 1, 3 and 37, which are rejected, now have been cancelled.

Claim 25, as it presently is amended, is distinguishable from claim 26. Claim 25 as originally written and claim 26 were compared by the Examiner in paragraph 4 on page 2 of the Office Action. Claim 25, as presently amended, now correctly states that the oncoming friction element starting pressure increases, while the boost time is reduced. This is indicated in the prior art priority table in Applicants' specification at Part 9, Priority 18B. Claim 26, in contrast to claim 25, recites the variation of the parameters that are indicated in the priority table, Part 8, Priority 19.

Claim 14 has been amended to indicate that flare is detected during torque transfer rather than before torque transfer.

Claim 15 has been cancelled in favor claim 14. This avoids a rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, which is discussed by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action.

Claim 16 has been amended to correctly state that the oncoming friction element starting pressure is decreased rather than increased. This characteristic was kindly noted by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action. This change avoids the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim 28 has been cancelled in favor of claim 29 since the subject matter defined by claim 29 corresponds generally to the subject matter of claim 28. Claim 41 has been cancelled in view of the cancellation of claim 37.

Atty Dkt No. FMC 1621 PUS / 202-1447

S/N: 10/712,071

Reply to Office Action of March 30, 2005

When rewriting the claims in independent form, the phrase "applying boost

time" in the second paragraph of each of claims 2, 4-14, 16-27, 29-36 and 38 has been

changed to "applying boost pressure." Further, the phrase "controlling the duration that the

boost time is applied" in the third paragraph has been changed to "controlling the boost time

that the boost pressure is applied." Still further, the seventh paragraph of each of claims 2,

4-14, 16-27, 29-36 and 38 is deleted since it is redundant, as the claims now appear, with

respect to the paragraphs that follow. The "adaptive shift characteristics" referred to in the

seventh paragraph are set forth in the last paragraph of each of rewritten claims 2, 4-14, 16-27

and 29-36 and in the penultimate paragraph of rewritten claim 38. These changes improve the

clarity of the claims by removing the redundancy, but do not affect the scope of the claims.

All of the claims that remain in the application have been indicated by the

Examiner to contain allowable subject matter. The objections indicated in paragraph 9 on page

6 of the Office Action are dealt with in this Amendment. It is believed that the application now

is in condition for allowance. The issuance of a Notice of Allowance at the Examiner's early

convenience is respectfully requested.

It is requested that the fee for the independent claims in excess of three and the

fee for excess total claims be charged to Ford Global Technologies LLC, Deposit Account No.

06-1510.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Cicala et al.

Donald J. Harrington

Reg. No. 17,427

Attorney for Applicants

Date: June 30, 2005

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.

1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor

Southfield, MI 48075-1238

Phone: 248-358-4400 / Fax: 248-358-3351